

In re Patent Application of
Gary L. Martin
Serial No. **09/801,512**
Filed **March 7, 2001**

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's careful review of the application, and offers these remarks in support of the amendments above, and the patentability of the claims.

Objections To The Drawings Are Now Moot

The Examiner's objections to the drawings have been addressed above.

The Claims Are Definite

Claims 9, 19, 31, and 39 have been clarified to address the Examiner's concerns regarding the language. In Claims 9 and 19, the term "elongated dimension" has been deleted and substituted with the term "lengthwise dimension" which is supported in the overlying independent claims. This was due to a mere typographical error when the language of the claims was edited prior to filing.

Similarly, and for consistency with the remaining claims, the language of Claim 31 was corrected to substitute the term "lengthwise dimension" for "elongated dimension." Claim 39 was corrected similarly. Applicant again notes that this was a typographical error upon editing prior to filing the application. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's careful review of the claims in that regard.

The Claims Are Novel Over The Cited References

Independent Claims 1, 10-11, and 20 stand rejected as anticipated by Hellekson (US 3,204,374). The Hellekson manufactured soffit, however, requires the interlocking and nailing of many different small parts, as illustrated in FIGS. 1-5. The present soffit comprises only two members, and the language of these claims has been clarified to recite

In re Patent Application of
Gary L. Martin
Serial No. **09/801,512**
Filed **March 7, 2001**

a "two-piece elongate continuous soffit panel" so that the ease of installation of the present soffit invention will be clear to the reader.

Similarly, Claims 1, 10-11, 20 and 31 stand rejected as anticipated by Chalmers (US 4,195,455). The Chalmers invention also includes many pieces which must be joined in order to create the soffit for a building. The clarifying amendment to the claims, now reciting "two-piece elongate continuous soffit panel" also addresses this concern.

Accordingly, neither Hellekson nor Chalmers can be said to anticipate the present soffit invention. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the claim rejections under Section 102.

The Claims Are Nonobvious And Patentable

In the pending Office Action no independent claims stand rejected as obvious or unpatentable under Section 103.


Conclusion

In view of the amendments and the remarks presented herein, it is submitted that these claims are patentable. Since no independent claims have been rejected under Section 103, their respective dependent claims, which recite yet further distinguishing features, are also patentable and require no further discussion.

In re Patent Application of
Gary L. Martin
Serial No. **09/801,512**
Filed **March 7, 2001**

If the further prosecution can be facilitated through a telephone conference between the Examiner and the undersigned, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at any convenient time.

Respectfully submitted,




Enrique G. Estévez
Reg. No. 37,823
Allen, Dyer, Doppelt, Milbrath & Gilchrist, P.A.
255 S. Orange Ave., Suite 1401
P. O. Box 3791
Orlando, Florida 32802
(407) 841-2330

Certificate of Service by Facsimile Telecopier

I hereby certify that this correspondence, addressed to Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231 is being filed with the United States Patent and Trademark Office by facsimile telecopier transmittal to ~~Group Art Unit 3635~~ ⁸⁷² at (703) ~~385~~ ³⁸⁵ ~~7637~~ ⁹³²⁶ as listed in the Office Action, on February ~~10~~ ¹⁷, 2003.

TELE CTR. 3600



Jim Dill